

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated November 1, 2006, claims 1-21 were rejected. Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicant is canceling claims 14-20 without prejudice and adding new claims 22-28 with this Amendment and Response. Applicant is amending claims 1 and 7 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

In the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 14-20 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Getting Started with RealPublisher, Version 5.1 (Software Manual, 12-2-1998) ("RealPublisher"). Claims 14-20 have been canceled, thereby addressing this rejection. Applicants reserve the right to pursue protection over the subject matter of claims 14-20 at a later point in time.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Chadda and Yap

In the 4th and 5th paragraphs of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-13 and 21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317

(“Chadda”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No.2002/0040475 (“Yap”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, the following:

storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data, the video token associated with the video data in the media vault *and indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data.* (emphasis added)

Thus, amended claim 1 recites storing a video token into a database, where the video token associates stored video data in the media vault with a web page that displays the stored video data. Storing a video token into a database beneficially simplifies integrating video data for display into a web page by removing the need to encode the video data for playback and store the video data with the displaying web page.

Chadda, as examiner notes, does not disclosed the claimed feature of “storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data, the video token associated with the video data in the media vault and indicating the video data is associated with a web page.” However, Yap does not remedy the deficiency in Chadda because it does not disclose the claimed feature “the video token associated with the video data in the media vault and indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data.” Yap discloses a DVR system where a database contains entries describing the content recorded and identifying the memory device where the recorded content is stored. Essentially, the database disclosed in Yap contains information received from an electronic program guide describing the recorded content. *See Yap*, Para. 126-127. However, Yap does not disclose that the database contains a video token associated with the video data indicating the video

data is associated with a web page, as recited in claim 1. Yap merely discloses using a database to identify the memory device where the recorded content is stored. *See Yap*, Para. 127. Thus, Yap fails to disclose the claimed feature of “the video token associated with the video data in the media vault and indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data.”

Moreover, aside from the prior noted deficiency correctly identified by Examiner, Chadda also does not disclose “indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data.” Chadda discloses annotation frames including event locators and event time markers which allow textual or graphical elements, such as URL addresses, to be retrieved or displayed at predetermined times specified by the time markers. *See Chadda*, col. 7, lines 14-30. However, these event locators and event time markers also not indicate “the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data,” rather the event locators and event time markers identify additional URL addresses containing elements to be displayed in place of, or in addition to, segments of the video data. These URL addresses do not indicate the “web page displaying the video data,” but rather recite the URL addresses where the additional elements are located. Thus, Chadda does not disclose “indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, there appears to be no suggestion or teaching in either Yap or Chadda to combine the references. Chadda discloses using annotation streams and a table of contents to allow client computers to access segments video data on a server. *See Chadda* col. 7, lines 45-59. This table of contents in Chadda is configured so that client computers access

different segments of stored video, allowing viewing of the stored video to begin at the selected segment or additional data to be displayed at certain video segments. *See* Chadda, col. 7, lines 15-40. In contrast, Yap discloses managing recorded content using a database describing the recorded content and the memory device containing the recorded content. *See* Yap, Para. 126. There is no suggestion in either reference that the annotation streams in Chadda are suitable for being managed by a database. However, even if the two references arguably could be combined together, at best the combined disclosure would be providing a database of recorded content, having a table of contents, indicating which memory device contains the recorded content. This does not disclose the claimed element of storing a video token “indicating the video data is associated with a web page” in a database. Hence, for at least this reason, the combination of these references fails to disclose the claimed invention.

The combination of Chadda and Yap likewise fails to disclose or suggest the claimed element of storing a video token indicating the video data is associated with a web page in a database. Neither Chadda nor Yap discloses storing data indicating the video data is associated with a web page. Yap discloses storing recorded content in a DVR while Chadda discloses incorporating a table of contents into stored video so segments of the video can be selected for viewing. This combination of storing recorded content in a DVR and using a table of contents to select video segments does not allow video data to be integrated into a displaying web page without requiring the video to be encoded for playback and stored with the web page, as amended claim 1 allows. Thus, the claimed element of storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data, the video token associated with the video data in the media vault and indicating the video data is associated with a web page”

is not disclosed in either reference. Thus, alone or in combination, Chadda and Yap do not disclose the claimed element of: “storing a video token...indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video content.”

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-6 and 21 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-6 and 21.

Claim 7, as amended, similarly recites:

storing a video token in a database, wherein the video token is associated with the video data and *indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data.* (emphasis added)

Therefore, all arguments advanced above with respect to amended claim 1 also apply to amended claim 7. As claims 8-13 are dependent on claim 7, all arguments advance above also apply to claims 8-13.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 1-13 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In summary, Examiner has failed to point out any prior art teaching which anticipates or renders obvious the explicit recitation in the language of claims 1 and 7, as amended, of “storing a video token...indicating the video data is associated with a web page displaying the video data.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant has added new claims 22-28 for which Applicant request consideration and examination. Applicant respectfully submits that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicant believes he is entitled.

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 and 21-28, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
GEORGES AUBERGER

Date: January 31, 2007

By: /Brian G. Brannon/

Brian G. Brannon, Attorney
Registration No. 57,219
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7610
Fax: (650) 938-5200